DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 451 CS 508 651

AUTHOR Emmers, Tara M.
TITLE Sex- and Gender-Differences in Emotion: A Preliminary Examination.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Communication Association (Oklahoma City, OK, April 7-10, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affective Behavior; *Communication Research; *Emotional Response; Higher Education; Literature Reviews; *Sex Differences; *Sex Role; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS Bem Sex Role Inventory

ABSTRACT

This paper offers a preliminary examination of literature reviewing sex and gender differences in the five prototypic emotions of fear, anger, sadness, joy, and love. The paper notes that within the literature on sex and gender differences, the terms "sex" and "gender" are often erroneously referred to interchangeably ("sex" is a biological term while "gender" encompasses both biological sex and "cultural associates with being male and female"). Drawing on physiological and psychological research--much of which was conducted at universities using college students as subjects--the paper discusses similarities and differences between men and women in their emotional experiences. The paper discusses an interactive model of gender related behavior. Moreover, the paper addresses conceptual and measurement concerns involved in examining sex and gender. Though hardly exhaustive, the paper does indicate how women and men express themselves and how emotional experiences are affected by both physiological factors as well as associations with sex and gender roles. Contains 59 references. (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 372 451

Sex- and Gender-Differences in Emotion: A Preliminary Examination

Tara M. Emmers

School of Interpersonal Communication

Lasher Hall

Ohio University

Athens, OH 45701

(614) 593-9164

emmers@ouvaxa.cats.ohiou.edu.internet

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at the Central States Communication Association Convention, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, April, 1994

Running Head: Gender and Emotion

CS508651

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Emmers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This paper offers a preliminary examination of literature reviewing sex- and gender-differences in the five prototypic emotions of fear, anger, sadness, joy, and love. Drawing from the physiological and psychological literature, similarities and differences between men and women in their emotional experiences is discussed. Moreover, conceptual and measurement concerns involved in examining sex and gender are addressed.

Sex- and Gender-Differences in Emotion: A Preliminary Examination

Emotion is a blanket term, covering numerous feelings and expressions of those feelings. Akin to an actual blanket or quilt, emotions resemble numerous converging patches representing varying presences and intensities. Some emotions are strong, pleasing, and well-established while others haunt, taunt, and wear at the seams of our well-being. Indeed, managing the emotional rollercoaster may very well contribute to one's personal "tearing at the seams." As living beings within the context of everyday interaction, we cannot elude emotions. Whether elated or deflated, emotions experienced and expressed by men and women impact one another and the relationship.

Conceptualizing various emotions is difficult. More difficult to discern is the varying degree in which men and women experience and express them. This paper offers a preliminary examination of sex- and gender-differences in five prototypic emotions (fear, anger, sadness, joy, and love).

Sex and Gender

Freimuth and Hornstein (1982) note the difficulties researchers have grappled with when examining sex and gender. Some researchers argue that differences exist between men and women (e.g., Jones & Dembo, 1989). Conversely, others argue that sex-differences are not as impressive as we have been led to believe (e.g., Canary & Hause, 1993; Dindia & Allen, 1992). Despite these claims, we inherently know that men and women do

differ in some respects. Within the realm of emotion, we recognize similarities and differences in how men and women express themselves. As noted by Sheinberg and Penn (1991), "Society tells its own story about the polarization of gender expectations--about how men and women are to feel and behave differently" (p. 34).

Within the literature on sex- and gender-differences, the terms "sex" and "gender" are often erroneously referred to interchangeably. Biological theories of sex assert that hormonal and physical components contribute to sex-differences (e.g., Unger, 1979). Grady (1979) argues that sex-differences lie within the individual with whom we interact. Thus, the sex of the other stimulates our behavior during interaction. Similarly, Bem (1981) argues that another's gender-schema influences our perception of sex-differences. Acknowledging another's sex or gender, then, can serve as a stimulus affecting our perception of sex-differences.

The term *gender* encompasses both biological sex and "cultural associates with being male and female" (Pearson, Turner, & Todd-Mancillas, 1991). In accordance with learning theories (e.g. Maccoby, 1966), the acquisition of gender identities and gender-related behaviors are learned as a result of societal influence (Vaughter, 1976). Within the realm of emotion, societal influence can have an enormous impact on how men and women cognitively process and express their emotions. Societal influence has led many to grasp and perpetuate

destructive gender stereotypes. For example, that men should not cry whereas it is acceptable for women to do so; women are encouraged to express positive affect openly (e.g., happiness, love) whereas men are encouraged to suppress such feelings; and expressing negative emotions (e.g., anger) is socially undesirable for women, but acceptable for men. These stereotypes may even be perpetuated by measurement. As noted by Deaux (1984) "The so-called 'masculinity' scale is primarily a measure of instrumentality, and the 'femininity' scale is primarily a measure of expressiveness" (p. 109). With respect to this paper, one must keep in mind that much of the sex and gender research utilizing the Bem Sex Role Inventory (1974) to examine sex- and gender-differences in emotion may be using a measure that perpetuates stereotypes. This notion is also supported by Canary and Hause (1993).

Emotion

What is emotion? As stated earlier, emotion is difficult to conceptualize in that individuals use various terminologies to describe how they feel and the degree to which they feel it. Some regard emotions as ubiquitous and constant, varying in degrees as a result of unexpected events. Others (e.g., Vangelisti, 1994) view emotions as something elicited from a base state as a result of interruptions in usual patterns of behavior. The notion of *base state*, however, is not clearly defined. Some researchers regard emotions as internal states (e.g., Ekman, 1983) whereas others view them as social relationships (Rivera &

Grinkis, 1986), as an expression of individuals to society (Radley, 1988), or as socially constructed (Kippax, Crawford, Benton, Gault, & Noesjirwan, 1988). Moreover, some research (e.g., Scherer & Tannenbaum, 1986) notes that, often, emotions blend and are difficult to distinguish. In particular, Scherer and Tannenbaum only found the emotions of happiness and anger to be pure states. Other emotions, such as sadness and fear, blended with other emotions.

Lee (1974) argues that the perhaps the one, most difficult task for two communicators is to define the emotion of love. Emotions in general are something that we continually experience, yet continually struggle to isolate into some concrete, comprehensible form. Although we know what emotion is, we experience difficulty in actually defining the nature of it (Fehr & Russell, 1984).

To examine the various descriptions of emotion, Shaver, Schwartz, Kirson, and O'Connor (1987) analyzed respondents' 213 descriptive terms for various emotions. Shaver et al.'s investigation revealed the emergence of five prototypic emotions: *fear*, *anger*, *sadness*, *joy*, and *love*. These five emotions are typically identified by people as basic, core emotions (e.g., Fehr & Russell, 1984). Because terminologies used to describe various emotions are vast, it is practical to focus on these five prototypes (and other terminologies subsumed under the prototypes) when examining the realm of emotion. Thus, this paper focuses on sex- and gender-differences regarding the

emotions of fear, anger, sadness, joy, and love.

Planalp (1992) poses an intriguing question regarding the concepts of cognition and emotion, "Should we speak of cognition in opposition to emotion or in conjunction with it?" (p. 1). This notion presents implications for research on sex- and gender-differences within the realm of self-report versus observational data. That is, is there necessarily a connection between "What I think I feel" and "What I express/emote"? As well, Planalp's inquiry brings attention to the notions of *what* and *why* we feel versus *how* we emote those feelings. Overall, examining men's and women's emotional experiences and episodes is worthy of pursuit. As stated by Planalp, "One of the most important functions of emotion is to guide us toward happiness, most importantly through our close relationships" (p. 21).

The Interactive Model of Gender-Related Behavior

On that note, it is necessary to explore the concept of emotion on both cognitive and emotional levels. Deaux and Major (1987) present an interactive model of gender-related behavior. Specifically, Deaux and Major argue that individuals are influenced by both cognitive and behavioral phenomena when interacting with others. First, we rely upon our cognitive schemes of gender. That is, we all possess a mental framework of how men and women should feel and behave. We do not, however, consistently rely upon our cognitive gender-schemes. There are also situational factors to be considered, which leads to the

second component of the interactive model.

How we behave during an interaction with others is also situationally-bound. According to Deaux and Major (1987), men and women are faced with an array of choices regarding how they decide to behave during a given interaction. To a degree, our choices are influenced by our gender-schemes. We are more apt to rely on our schemes when we're unfamiliar with the other individual and/or the situation. Specifically, our schemes serve as a relied-upon referent when the individual and/or situation poses information unfamiliar or deviant to us. Thus, we're more likely to rely upon our macro gender-schemes as a referent than base how we feel and how we act upon the micro behaviors presented by the other and/or the situation.

However, we exercise behavioral choices (e.g., fear, anger, joy) more freely when we're immersed in a more comfortable, recognizable situation. Our choices are impacted by the behavior of the other within the context of the interactive situation. As a result, we tend to deviate from our macro gender-scheme referent in that we find comfort in and are able to make better sense of the micro behaviors and information emitted from a particular situation.

Confounded with the situational context are other issues, such as social desirability, sex- and gender-stereotypes, and personality variables. For example, Emmons and Diener (1986) found that degree of temperament was related to particular emotions and concluded that "Certain emotional feelings may be

more or less 'prototypical' for different personality types" (p. 383).

Although Deaux and Major (1987) assert that men and women have equal access to an abundance of behavioral choices within a given situation, do they? Deaux and Major's model provides insight into the impact of gender-schemes and situational contexts on why men and women emote as they do within relationships. However, their model does not account for sexual, biological, or physiological factors involved in emotional experiences. Nevertheless, from a communicative standpoint, it is necessary to go one step further and investigate *how* men and women convey their emotions.

Sex- and Gender-Differences and Emotion

This section reviews various research examining how men and women experience and convey the emotions of fear, anger, sadness, joy, and love. Often, studies have investigated similar phenomena under various terminological banners (e.g., happiness versus joy; affection versus love). Various studies (e.g., Fehr & Russell, 1984; Shaver et al., 1987) on emotion, however, provide a workable framework for examining the basic, core, prototypic emotions. Shaver et al. (1987) also identify the emotions subsumed under and reflective of each of the five prototypes, enabling a review of the literature on each respective emotional prototype without wrestling with semantic issues.

Fear

Much of the research on men's and women's experiences of fear indicates that women experience more fear than men (e.g., Chambless, 1982; Stafford & Galle, 1984; Warr, 1984). However, men and women may have different conceptualizations of fear. For example, Lohr, Hamberger, and Bonge (1988) found that, when examining physical injury factors, men viewed physical injury as pertaining to damage to oneself or property. Women, on the other hand, had more of an emotional conceptualization of physical injury. Specifically, women viewed being physically injured as being "treated unfairly or being taken advantage of by others" (p. 179). Moreover, Blier and Blier-Wilson (1989) found that women feel more confident than men expressing fear and sadness to both men and women.

Dillon, Wolf, and Katz (1985) note conflicting results when examining the effects of sex and gender on experienced fear. Specifically, from a sexual standpoint, men experience more fear and the result of this fear manifests in health problems. Others argue, however, that women experience more fear from a gender standpoint. That is, association with the feminine gender-role is related to higher reported fear whereas association with the masculine gender-role is associated with lower reported fear (Bankston, Thompson, Jenkins, & Forsyth, 1993).

In an examination of physiological differences between the sexes, Levenson, Ekman, and Friesen (1990) found autonomic differences among the negative emotions of anger, fear, disgust,

and sadness and the positive emotions of happiness and surprise. However, they found no significant autonomic differences among emotions between men and women.

Dillon et al., (1985) examined how men and women experienced fear across the Bem's (1974) four sex-role categories (masculine, feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated). Using self-report data from the Wolpe (1969) Fear Inventory, Dillon et al. found that women scored higher in fear than did men. Moreover, sex- and gender-role contributed equally to the variability across scores.

Often, we are confronted with situations that induce fear. This concept can be dissected into fear for ourselves (personal fear) as well as fear for others (altruistic fear) (Warr, 1992). As noted, much of past research has indicated that women experience more personal fear than men (e.g., Warr, 1984).

Warr (1992) also examined *altruistic* fear. Unlike personal fear, altruistic fear focuses on the fear we experience for others. That is, while threatening situations may cause us to feel personal fear, we also fear for the well-being of those close to us, such as a spouse or child. Given traditional stereotypes of women being more nurturing and caretaking than men, Warr expected women to experience more altruistic fear than men for household members. Overall, however, Warr found that men experienced more altruistic fear for their household members (49%) than women experienced (41%). Interestingly, 33% of men experienced altruistic fear for their wives, whereas only 10% of

the wives experienced altruistic fear for their husbands. In regard to children, however, women experienced much more altruistic fear than men (38% versus 11%, respectively). Consistent with sex-and gender-stereotypes, Warr concluded that these results support the notion that women are responsible for the welfare of the children and, most likely, view men as being able to care for themselves.

Whereas Warr (1992) argued that women may view men as stronger, more aggressive, and therefore able to take care of themselves, Eagly and Steffen (1986) offer a possible reason as to why women may not view themselves as strong or aggressive. In a meta-analysis, Eagly and Steffen (1986) found that women experienced anxiety and fear about possible *outcomes* of being forthright and aggressive, consistent with Warr's (1984) finding that women experience more fear for their personal safety than men.

According to Nicholson (1993), there is fault in of many of the measures examining gender differences in fear. Specifically, the items in many of the measures gear toward situations that women would find frightening whereas men would not.

In sum, fear has been shown to contribute to more health problems in men than in women (e.g., Dillon, Wolf, & Katz, 1985). Perhaps the pressure associated with being strong and capable of dealing with all situations takes its toll on individuals feeling the need to fulfill such a role.

Anger

On that note, Eisler, Skidmore, and Ward (1988) argued that males' identification with the masculine gender-role would contribute to elevated anger and stress in comparison to women. Using the Masculine Gender-Role Stress questionnaire (MGRS), Eisler et al. hypothesized that men would experience more stress than women when attempting to live-up to male expectations or when immersed in a situation that required *feminine* behaviors. Results indicated that men experience much more masculine gender-role related stress than women. Moreover, both men and women who identified with the masculine gender-role experienced elevated anger, stress, and health problems. Thus, men and women alike, who try to fulfill the masculine stereotype of being ever-vigilant, headstrong, and unbreakable, experience elevated anger and distress. Interestingly, the MGRS had no correlation with masculinity, as measured by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974). Again, the difference may lie in the distinction between situational factors (micro) as measured by the MGRS versus the overall gender-scheme (macro), as measured by the PAQ.

Janisse, Edguer, and Dyck (1986) examined Type A behavior, anger, and gender on control and heart rate. Results from the self-report and heart rate data revealed that Type A and B males differed from Type A and B females. Specifically, Type A males high in anger expressiveness displayed much more anger, more acute anger imagery, and less perceived control than Type A, low

anger expressives, Type B, high anger expressives, and Type B, low anger expressives. Janisse et al. concluded that need for control may be a central need for Type A individuals and this need is driven not only by situational factors, but by anger expression as well as gender. This finding mirrors Emmons and Diener's (1986) assertion that different personality types (e.g., temperamentality) affect varying levels of emotion.

Similarly, Friedman and Miller-Herringer (1991), in a nonverbal study, found that men were more likely to experience and exhibit more anger than women. Perhaps, then, males' perception of fulfilling their gender-role may exacerbate their situation and is revealed through increased anger expression and heart rate.

In another physiological investigation, Gottman and Levenson (1992) examined the prototypic emotions revealed in speaker affect between married couples and how such processes were associated with marital dissolution over a four year period. Couples were classified as either regulated or nonregulated. Regulated couples' interactions were typified by both husbands' and wives' speaking slopes being significantly positive. In nonregulated couples, at least one of the speaker slopes (either husband or wife) was not significantly positive. Results indicated that husbands in regulated marriages were more neutral, showed more affection, were less angry, and whined less than wives. Does this mean that women in marriage are more angry than men? Not necessarily. Gottman and Levenson (1992) note that

women often take the responsibility to regulate the affective balance in marriage by initiating negative affect. This initiation of anger is not necessarily relationally negative in that it brings the problematic issues out into the open. In nonregulated couples, however, women/wives may intensify their anger, which may be dysfunctional to the well-being of the marriage. Perhaps women taking responsibility for addressing the problems at hand parallels the gender stereotypes concerning women's pursuit of relational harmony. Interestingly, in that gender stereotypes also prescribe that it's not socially acceptable for women to be angry, why would women engage in angry episodes?

Egerton (1988) addressed this question from an attributional perspective, specifically, that women may attribute their anger to an external locus of control rather than to an internal one, as men may. Testing Averill's (1984) rule model of anger, Egerton examined norms of aggression possessed by the two sexes. Those who have strong norms against aggression are more likely to attribute their personal anger to passion. Typically, women fall into this category and are more likely to attribute their anger to an uncontrollable, outside force (e.g., "something came over me and I couldn't help myself"). Men, conversely, would more typically attribute anger to something internal and within their control. Egerton predicted that women would regard anger as more costly to norms and the overall situation and as more upsetting than men. Results indicated that women did view the episode as

being more costly to the relationship, life-scripts, and as more upsetting than men. However, women did not view the behavior as more unacceptable than men. Interestingly, women gained more satisfaction from achieving their specific goal, although they were not more satisfied overall than men. This result may fit into the micro versus macro schemas mentioned earlier. Specifically, women may feel situational and periodic triumph for achieving their goal. However, in the overall, macro scheme of things, women may have reported being less satisfied in that exhibition of anger is out of sync with the gender-scheme of expected behavior for women.

Lohr, Hamberger, and Bonge (1988) also examined situational versus overall anger arousal. Specifically, they measured propensity for anger and irrational beliefs between men and women utilizing the Novaco Anger Scale (NAS) (Novaco, 1975). They did find gender differences in regard to situational anger arousal. For example, men viewed inconsiderate others as being inconsiderate or obnoxious strangers. Women, on the other hand, viewed inconsiderate others as relating to one-sided, but familiar others. Interestingly, men showed responsiveness to physical or chaotic situations whereas women were responsive with anger in uncontrollable situations. This finding parallels Egerton's (1988) assertion that women have stronger norms against aggression and would be more like to attribute anger to uncontrollable external forces. Lohr et al. (1988) concluded that, for women, anger-inducing situations may be affected by

relational quality whereas it may be affected by the physical consequences of the interaction for men. Possibly, then, "feminine sex-role socialization involves the acquisition of irrational beliefs that serve to suppress anger expression because it may be perceived as gender-inappropriate." (p. 182).

Sadness

As noted earlier, the feeling of sadness often blends with other emotions, such as anger (Scherer & Tannenbaum, 1986). Other feelings, such as experiencing low self-esteem or feeling depressed, can contribute to our feeling of sadness. Moreover, many may regard experiencing low self-esteem or depression as "feeling sad."

Zuckerman (1989) examined sex differences in experienced stress and how that factor influenced self-esteem, depression, and anxiety. She found that, while both men and women experienced levels of stress, women reported more stress over mental health and familial relationships. This latter finding is consistent with Lohr et al.'s (1988) finding that women experience more anger over distress in close relationships than men.

Zuckerman (1989) also found that men and women differed in how they managed stress. Women were more likely to feel depressed over the situation and were also more likely to vent their anger and express how they felt than men. This finding is consistent with Gottman and Levenson's (1992) finding that women initiated negative affect in conversations more than men.

Zuckerman (1989) also found that expressing anger and feelings was associated with lower coping and self-sufficiency and men self-reported themselves as being higher is coping and self-sufficiency than women. When feeling stressed, men increased activity rather than becoming depressed. Interestingly, men who increased activity rated themselves higher on leadership and public speaking ability. Zuckerman notes that increased activity by men under stressful situations was "inversely correlated with depression and is the only response pattern that was more common among the men than the women" (p. 442).

Friedman and Miller-Herringer (1991) examined men's and women's emotional expressiveness and high and low self-monitoring skills in social and solitary settings. Women were more expressive nonverbally (including sadness) than men. As noted earlier, men seem to be more expressive within the domain of anger than women. Another study (Dore' & Kirouac, 1985), however, found no sex differences in men's and women's abilities to determine emotion from verbal descriptions of several situations and interactions.

In another nonverbal study, Rotter and Rotter (1988) examined facial expressions eliciting the negative emotions of anger, disgust, fear and sadness. Results indicated that women were better able to identify all emotions expressed by both males and females. The only exception was that men were better able to recognize male-anger than women. Rotter and Rotter concluded that male's anger may be easier to identify than female's in that

men tend to externalize anger whereas women internalize it. This conclusion parallels earlier mentioned findings and fits into the gender-stereotype that its more acceptable for men to exhibit anger.

Toner and Gates (1985) also examined sex differences in encoding of facial expressions, but with a twist. Specifically, they examined the effect of men's and women's emotional tendencies on their ability to encode facial expressions. Results indicated that women with inhibited, nonassertive personalities were less successful at emotional recognition than more socially oriented females. For males, the relationship between emotional disposition and identifying emotions was more particular to emotion itself. For example, males' dispositions were related to identifying the specific emotions of anger, fear, surprise, and disgust.

Conway, Giannopoulos, and Stiefenhofer (1990) examined the association between sex-role orientation and sadness. Specifically, they examined actions taken by men and women when sadness was experienced. Consistent with gender stereotypes, the feminine sex-role was associated with dwelling on the sadness whereas the masculine sex-role was associated with distraction when sadness was experienced. Similarly, more women than men experienced dwelling on the sadness and less distraction. This finding is consistent with Zuckerman's (1989) finding that men increased activity when confronted with stressful situations whereas women subscribed to becoming depressed.

Joy/and Happiness

In examining the prototypic emotions, Scherer and Tannenbaum (1986) found that happiness occurs as the most frequently occurring pure state. In a comprehensive review of research examining sex-differences and well-being, Wood, Rhodes, and Whelan (1989) found that women reported more happiness and life satisfaction than men. Sex-differences in well-being were shown to be due to marital status. Wood et al. concluded that overall findings were due to the fact that the feminine gender-role calls for greater emotional responsiveness.

Fujita, Diener, and Sandvik (1991) examined gender differences in affect. Although women experienced more negative affect than men, this was counterbalanced by women's stronger positive affect. Overall, however, they found no gender differences in experiencing happiness.

Similarly, Fugl-Meyer, Branholm, and Fugl-Meyer (1991) examined the impact of gender and age on happiness within a Swedish population. Although women were more satisfied than men in regard to relations with one's partner, family life, and sex, overall happiness was not impacted by either age or gender.

In a physiological study, Delp and Sackeim (1987) examined the effects of mood on lacrimal flow in males and females. In females, lacrimal flow increased following the sadness manipulation and significantly decreased after the happiness manipulation. Mood manipulation did not significantly influence lacrimal flow in males.

Love

Heiss (1991) examined gender differences in love-role definitions. He hypothesized that there would be gender-differences in male/female intimate relationships such that women would be more other-oriented and men would dominate the relationship. Results revealed that women were not more other-oriented. In fact, women assigned the most other-orientation to men and the least to themselves. In that these data were collected from college students, Heiss concluded that this deviation from strongly accepted gender-love-role beliefs may due to an influx of feminism within the sample.

Extracting from the feminist literature, Critelli, Myers, and Loos (1986) examined the relationship between sex-role orientation and types of love experienced. Five different dimensions of love were examined (romantic dependency, communicative intimacy, physical arousal, respect, and romantic compatibility). Results indicated that women subscribing to the feminine sex-role scored high on romantic dependency, romantic compatibility, and respect. Males subscribing to the masculine sex-role scored high on romantic dependency and romantic compatibility. Physical arousal was not associated with sex-role orientation for males or females. Nontraditional females scored high on communicative intimacy and favorable emotional statements, but not respect. Nontraditional males scored high on communicative intimacy and respect. In accordance with the assumption that women are more emotionally expressive than males,

women scored higher overall on communicative intimacy than males. Overall, then, traditional males and females seemed to grasp the romantic dependency and romantic compatibility dimensions of love whereas nontraditional males and females seemed to grasp communicative intimacy.

Bailey, Hendrick, and Hendrick (1987) examined love styles and sexual attitudes and their relationship to masculinity and femininity. Results supported accepted beliefs regarding the association between gender-roles and notions of love. Specifically, game playing (Ludus) was positively related to masculinity and negatively related to femininity. Possessive and dependent love types (Manic) were positively related to femininity and negatively related to masculinity. Females were also more pragmatic (Pragma) than males. Finally, masculinity was not related to the love attitudes of Eros, Storge, Agape, or Pragma. Femininity, on the other hand, was related to all six love types. Overall, Bailey et al. concluded that both sex- and gender-role orientation are strong predictors of sexual attitudes and love.

In a later study, Hendrick and Hendrick (1991) examined gender differences within the framework of five love dimensions (passion, closeness, attachment, manic love, and practicality) within a college sample. As expected, and similar to earlier research, females had a higher propensity for closeness and practicality in their love relationships than men. Unlike earlier research, however, females were also subscribed to more

passion (Eros) than males. Hendrick and Hendrick concluded that perhaps college females hold higher passionate love orientations than college males.

Although Hendrick and Hendrick (1991) found that university women subscribed to more passion (e.g., sexual chemistry) than men, Foa, Anderson, Converse, Urbansky, Cawley, Muhlhausen, and Tornblom (1987) tested the assertion that males differentiate love and sex more strongly than females with American and Swedish samples. Within both cultures, women were more likely to compound love and sex more than men. Overall, Americans differentiated love and sex more than Swedes.

Similarly, Glass and Wright (1992) examined the effects of gender on extramarital affairs when considering sex, romantic love, emotional intimacy, and extrinsic factors as justifications. Women were more accepting of love, rather than sex, as a justification for an extramarital affair than men. Results also revealed that women seem to grasp the belief that love and sex go together and being in love justifies sexual involvement. Conversely, men appeared to separate sex and love.

Conclusion

As implied in the title of this paper, this review of literature is a preliminary examination of sex- and gender-differences and emotion. While hardly exhaustive, this paper does, however, indicate how men and women express themselves and how emotional experiences are affected by both physiological factors as well as associations with sex- and gender-roles. More

difficult to discern within the realm of physiological differences, however, is whether or not physiological differences are purely due to sex-differences or if men and women in such studies rely upon gender-schemes as referents. As a result of identification with the referent, physiological outcomes are induced accordingly.

While much more investigation is needed within the plethora of literature available on sex- and gender-differences and emotion, some interesting insights did emerge from the review of studies within this paper. Specifically, there seems to be a trend to attribute emotional experiences to situational components versus gender-scheme components. For example, within that realm of anger, some of the research indicates that women are more situationally angry and likely to emote negative affect than men (Gottman & Levenson, 1992). Although situationally satisfied with their anger expression, women are not satisfied overall with their anger expression. Seemingly, when extracted from the situation, women revert to their gender-scheme of what is *appropriate* and find dissatisfaction knowing that they acted in a manner out of sync with what is expected of them. Rather than credit themselves with expressing the emotion of anger, women seem to attribute the emotion to uncontrollable, extrinsic, forces whereas men do not (Egerton, 1988).

Other issues in need of further attention involve separating research that examines sex-differences from a physiological standpoint versus a psychological, gender-role focus. Moreover,

Canary and Hause (1993) acknowledged much of the extant literature on gender-differences relies upon stereotypes versus actual differences. This concern is also recognized by Deaux (1984), who notes that many of the measures used in gender studies contain items that perpetuate the notion that women are more expressive than men and that men are more instrumental than women. Similarly, Nicholson (1993) acknowledges that many instruments measuring emotions utilize items focusing on scenarios (i.e., fearful situations) that would impact women directly whereas they would not be of concern for men.

While the literature reviewed thus far offers some support for sex- and gender-differences, a more extensive dissection is necessary within the realm of variables examined (i.e., physiological versus psychological). Moreover, the measures used within many of the studies merit attention and further investigation in that the instruments themselves may have impacted the results and inferences extracted regarding differences between men and women within the realm of emotion.

References

Averill, J. R. (1982). Anger and aggression: An essay in emotion. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Bailey, W. C., Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. S. (1987). Relation of sex and gender role to love, sexual attitudes, and self-esteem. Sex Roles, 16 (11-12), 637-648.

Bankston, W. R., Thompson, C. Y., Jenkins, Q. A., & Forsyth, C. J. (1990). The influence of fear of crime, gender, and a southern culture on carrying firearms for protection, Sociological Quarterly, 31 (2), 287-305.

Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex-typing. Psychological Review, 88, 354-364.

Blier, M. J., & Blier-Wilson, L. A. (1989). Gender differences in self-rated emotional expressiveness. Sex Roles, 7 (3-4), 287-295.

Canary, D. J., & Hause, K. S. (1993). Is there any reason to research sex differences in communication? Communication Quarterly, 41 (2), 129-144.

Chambless, D. L. (1982). Characteristics of agoraphobics. In D. L. Chambless and A. J. Goldstein (Eds.), Agoraphobia multiple perspectives on theory and treatment. New York: Wiley.

Conway, M., Giannopoulos, C., & Stiefenhofer, K. (1990). Response styles to sadness are related to sex and sex-role orientation. Sex Roles, 22 (9-10), 579-587.

Critelli, J. W., Myers, E. J., & Loos, V. E. (1986). The components of love: Romantic attraction and sex role orientation. Journal of Personality, 54 (2), 354-370.

Deaux, K. (1984, February). From individual differences to social categories: Analysis of a decade's research on gender. American Psychologist, 39 (2), 105-116.

Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1987). Putting gender into context: An interactive model of gender-related behavior. Psychological Review, 94 (3), 369-389.

Delp, M. J., & Sackheim, H. A. (1987). Effects of mood on lacrimal flow: Sex differences and asymmetry. Psychophysiology, 24 (5), 550-556.

Dillon, K. M., Wolf, E., & Katz, H. (1985). Sex roles, gender, and fear. The Journal of Psychology, 119 (4), 355-359.

Dindia, K. A., & Allen, M. (1992). Sex differences in self-disclosure: A meta analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 112, 106-124.

Dore', F. Y., & Kirouac, G. (1985). Identifying the eliciting situations of six fundamental emotions. The Journal of Psychology, 119 (5), 423-440.

Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. Psychological Bulletin, 100, 309-330.

Egerton, M. (1988). Passionate women and passionate men: Sex differences in accounting for angry and weeping episodes. British Journal of Social Psychology, 27, 51-66.

Eisler, R. M., Skidmore, J. R., & Ward, C. H. (1988). Masculine gender-role stress: Predictor of anger, anxiety, and health-risk behaviors. Journal of Personality Assessment, 52 (1), 133-141.

Ekman, P. (1983). Autonomic nervous system activity distinguishes among emotions. Science, 221, 1208-1210.

Emmons, R. A., & Diener, E. (1986). An interactional approach to the study of personality and emotion. Journal of Personality, 54 (2), 371-384.

Fehr, B., & Russell, J. A. (1984). Concept of emotion viewed from a prototype perspective. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 113, 464-486.

Foa, U. G., Anderson, B., Converse, J., Urbansky, W. A., Cawley, M. J., Muhlhausen, S. M., & Tornblom, K. Y. (1987). Gender-related sexual attitudes: Some cross-cultural similarities and differences. Sex Roles, 16 (9-10), 511-519.

Freimuth, M. J., & Hornstein, G. A. (1982). A critical examination of the concept of gender. Sex Roles, 8 (5), 515-532.

Friedman, H. S., Miller-Herringer, T. (1991). Nonverbal display of emotion in public and private: Self-monitoring, personality, and expressive cues. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61 (5), 766-775.

Fugl-Meyer, A. R., Branholm, I. B., & Fugl-Meyer, K. S. (1991). Happiness and domain-specific life satisfaction in adult Northern Swedes. Clinical Rehabilitation, 5 (1), 25-33.

Fujita, F., Diener, E., & Sandvik, E. (1991). Gender differences in negative affect and well-being: The case for emotional intensity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61 (3), 427-434.

Glass, S. P., & Wright, T. L. (1992). Justifications for extramarital relationships: The association between attitudes, behaviors, and gender. The Journal of Sex Research, 29 (3), 361-387.

Gottman, J. M., & Levenson, R. W. (1992). Marital processes predictive of later dissolution: Behavior, physiology, and health. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63 (2), 221-233.

Grady, K. (1979). Androgyny reconsidered. In J. H. Williams (Ed.), Psychology of women: Selected readings. New York: Norton.

Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. (1991). Dimensions of love: A sociobiological interpretation. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 10 (2), 206-230.

Heiss, J. (1991). Gender and romantic-love roles. The Sociological Quarterly, 32 (4), 575-591.

Janisse, M. P., Edguer, N. & Dyck, D. G. (1986). Type A behavior, anger expression, and reactions to anger imagery. Motivation and Emotion, 10 (4), 371-386.

Jones, G. P., & Dembo, M. H. (1989). Age and sex role differences in intimate relationships during childhood and adolescence. Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 35 (4), 445-462.

Kippax, S., Crawford, J., Benton, P., Gault, U., & Noesjirwan, J. (1988). Constructing emotions: Weaving meaning from memories. British Journal of Social Psychology, 27, 19-33.

Lee, J. A. (1974, October). The styles of loving. Psychology Today, 8, 43-51.

Levenson, R. W., Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1990). Voluntary facial action generates emotion-specific autonomic nervous system activity. Psychophysiology, 27 (4), 363-384.

Lohr, J. M., Hamberger, L. K., & Bonge, D. (1988). The relationship of factorially validated measures of anger-proneness and irrational beliefs. Motivation and Emotion, 12 (2), 171-183.

Maccoby, E. E. (Ed.). (1966). The development of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Nicholson, J. (1993). Men and women: How different are they? Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Novaco, R. W. (1975). Anger control: The development and evaluation of an experimental treatment. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Pearson, J. C., Turner, L. H., & Todd-Mancillas, W. (1991). Gender and communication. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.

Planalp, S. (1992). Cognition and/or emotion in close relationships. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL.

Radley, A. (1988). The social form of feeling. British Journal of Social Psychology, 27, 5-18.

Rivera, J., & Grinkis, C. (1986). Emotions as social relationships. Motivation and Emotion, 10 (4), 351-369.

Rotter, N. G., & Rotter, G. S. (1988). Sex differences in the encoding and decoding of negative facial emotions. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 12 (2), 139-148.

Sheinberg, M., & Penn, P. (1991). Gender dilemmas, gender questions, and the gender mantra. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 17, 33-44.

Scherer, K. R., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (1986). Emotional experiences in everyday life: A survey approach. Motivation and Emotion, 10 (4), 295-314.

Shaver, P., Schwartz, J., Kirson, D., & O'Connor, C. (1987). Emotion knowledge: Further exploration of a prototypic approach. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52 (6), 1061-1086.

Spence, J. T., Heilmreich, R. L., & Stapp, J. (1974). The personal attributes questionnaire: A measure of sex-role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 4, 43-44.

Stafford, M. C., & Galle, O. G. (1984). Victimization rates, exposure to risk, and fear of crime. Criminology, 22, 173-185.

Toner, H. L., & Gates, G. R. (1985). Emotional traits and recognition of facial expression of emotion. Journal of Non-verbal Behavior, 9 (1), 48-66.

Unger, R. K. (1979, November). Toward a redefinition of sex and gender. American Psychologist, 34 (11), 1085-1094.

Vangelisti, A. (1994). Messages that hurt. In W. R. Cupach & B. H. Spitzberg (Eds.), The dark side of interpersonal communication (pp. 53-82). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum & Associates.

Vaughter, R. M. (1976). Review essay: Psychology. Signs, 2, 120-146.

Warr, M. (1984). Fear of victimization: Why are women and the elderly more afraid? Social Science Quarterly, 65, 681-702.

Warr, M. (1992). Altruistic fear of victimization in households. Social Science Quarterly, 73 (4), 723-736.

Wood, W., Rhodes, N., & Whelan, M. (1989). Sex differences in positive well-being: A consideration of emotional style and marital status. Psychological Bulletin, 106 (2), 249-264.

Zuckerman, D. M. (1989). Stress, self-esteem, and mental health: How does gender make a difference? Sex Roles, 20 (7-8), 429-444.